known him for years. Personal friends. My conversations with him on the subject of a very general character. Did not know of his personal affairs.

Asked if I had talked to any one about the subject since Pres. Smith's statement in the Tabernacle five years ago. and to whom. If any one had talked to me, and whom. Answer, yes but any such conversations were of a confidential nature and I did not feel at liberty to divulge them.

This attitude was criticised strongly by Bros. Lyman, Smith and Grant, but I could not change.

Asked if I had heard of any body claiming that people could "get in" now. I said I presume I could go out on the street and find two hundred people who would claim that.

Who are they? The Saints generally.

Why should they claim it? Because it is generally understood that many were permitted to "get in" since the Woodruff Manifesto, but and that being true, the people think the opportunity is still open.

Do you think so? Yes, I have an idea it is.

Thursday July 22-09.

Was requested to attend a meeting with Pres. Francis M. Lyman, in the Temple at 4:30. I waited until 6 P.M. when I was invited into the Apostles' room where an inquisition was being held by Pres. Lyman and the following members of the Quorum: John Henry Smith, Heber J. Grant, Rudger Clawson, Orson F. Whitney, David O. McKay, Geo. F. Richards and Antony W. Ivins.

Object of inquisition, to get information regarding the practice of Plural Marriage since the discontinuance thereof by the church; also to allay those who are now forming the practice, against it.

Was grilled two hours by the brethren and declared out of harmony by Bro. Grant and Pres. Lyman several times. The proceedings were in substance as follows:

Asked if I knew Bro. A. J. Higgs who had recently entered the Principle, if I had talked to him and given him any encouragement or information on that subject. Answer: I have

understands his & affairs better than I do.
Had I ever talked with any leading brethren on the subject? Yes with such men as Pres. Snow, Cannon (Geo. Q.) and Bro. Merrill.
Since five years ago? I have talked to Bro. Merrill.
How many times? I had two conversations with him.
What were the nature of them? I can't tell.
Have you taken additional blessings during last five years? I can't answer (Some of brethren) That does that be law.
Now Bro. Musser, we want you hereafter to join with us in putting this thing down. If any body comes to you for information or encouragement, tell them it can't be done, that it is wrong to desire and that no attention whatever should be bestowed upon the matter with this in view. Pres. Lyman, I can't do that, but I suggest if you have any instructions to give me, it should be done thru my stake President with whom I am in harmony and I will endeavor to remain so. This answer both our hearts are animated

What right have you to think so? The same as I have expressed.
Have you ever had any talk on the subject with Pres. Taylor or Jno. W. Cannon? Ans: These brethren are good faithful men, having the spirit of their calling, and if you will ask them I feel sure they will tell you anything you should know.
But we are asking you. I can't tell you.
Some time was spent in endeavoring to show me my mistake in not answering this question but I still refused.
Asked who could perform such marriages: Ans. I didn't pretend to know, but Pres. Smith had the keys and could authorize them if he desired, without consulting anyone.
Had he done it? I don't know. Has he ever told you anything on the subject? That is for him to answer.
Would the authority have to come from him to either grant or revoke the privilege? I so understand.
Then how could I think such privilege exists. I need not pretend to say. Pres. Smith

stand by each other. Ans. I do not and have never heard of such an organization.

Bro. Ingram said, dont you know that Bro. Taylor and Cowley were dropped from their quorum for being out of harmony as you are. Bro. Whitney injected the remark that the Saints dont consider they they were out of harmony, but simply a necessary sacrifice.

Bro. Ingram said, what do you think Bro. Murray: I feel just that way.

What right have you to think that? Because I believe there are others that were just as deserving to be dropped as they, but the necessity for it did not seem to demand it.

Who are they. I dont wish to say. However I consider Bro. Merrill and Teasdale good men.

Bro. Clawson said: Bros. Taylor and Cowley offered to harmonize themselves with the Quorum They admitted they had been out of harmony, but offered to put themselves right. (A discussion among

discussion on the subject of authority the brethren in the main contending that it was none of the business of the Stake Presidency what should be required by the General Authorities of individuals. I took the ground that instructions might be given by the Apostles contrary to those received by my Stake President, in which event I would be justified in following counsel of Stake Pres. and leaving responsibility with him. This position was endorsed in fact as I best felt with illustrations but as pertaining to the present subject it was declared wrong. They asked, suppose Pres. Taylor or a Bishop is out of harmony. Ans. You would remove the Pres. if out of harmony or if a Bishop. the Stake Pres. would remove him.

Bro. Grant, asked have not we the right to go into your Stake and set things right? Yes if you are sent by the Pres. of the Church. This was sustained.

Bro. Smith asked: Do you belong to an oath bound organization bound together by covenants and oaths to

the brethren). Bro Lyman emphatically said, "I want this body of men to understand they did not harmonize themselves with the Quorum."
Pressed for an answer that I would put myself in harmony. I promised that should the occasion arise for me to answer a brother's inquiry as to how he might get in, I would be willing to tell him how the Quorum of the Apostles stood and Pres. Smith's statement, and should he was still want encouragement, I would advise him to lay his case before the Lord in prayer.
To this most of the brethren strenuously objected, a number making light of prayer on such a subject and Bro. Grant asked why I would advise them to pray. I Ans. because I prayed about it and got an answer. I recounted my feelings and experience since the Word of Wisdom manifesto, culminating in my desires being gratified.
Great pressure was brought to bear on me to "get in harmony," my final answer being that I would endeavor

to be in harmony, but I could not promise what my future course might be in case new light came upon the subject.
Bro. Lyman a number of times said: He answers just like the other brethren who are in the same position, while those who are not are ready in a moment to be in harmony. One would think these brethren had rehearsed their pieces.
Bro. Irvine contended that it was a sin to break the law of the land while it was not wrong to practice polygamy formerly before the law against it had been pronounced ~~unconstitutional~~, but I sustained in the statement that marriages took place in our church, by authority and were approved, after the law had been finally passed upon. And that being the case the morality of the thing was no different now than formerly. I said, I may be a law breaker, but so is Pres. Smith. Bro. Irvine said, no

he went. I said Thank the Lord he is. Bro. Clawson said he escaped imprisonment by the skin of his teeth.

Bro. Clawson asked Bro. Lorin if he considered it was wicked to practice the principle after the Edmund. Tucker act that it was after the Polland act which was previous. He Ans. Yes he did.

His position was criticised by the brethren, Pres. Hy. Smith stating, even after the Wordruff manifesto, pure Marriage were Authorized in Mexico as there it didnot conflict with the law of the land, but where Bro. T. H. went wrong was in doing it in United States.

Bro. Smith said he had obtained the consent of a woman to marry him and had the matter all fixed, but since the Manifesto, but upon the advice of the Pres. of Church, he broke off the engagement.

I answered I didnot do that, and I saw not see that it was any more to do it now than then

if it was authorized.

Bro. Lyman said: We have given our pledge against it, and it gives them a chance to talk about us.

I answered that no matter what we did or didnot do, they would talk about us if we did right. and one of the brethren (I think Bro. Whitney) said, if Jos Reams had been returned to the Senate there would be no talk about us.

I asked if it was not a fact that in the beginning the Prophet did not proclaim to the world that the principle was not being practiced while the brethren were entering it. Yes, but the conditions were different then than now. He said it was not meant for the church then; and Bro. Smith said it never was meant for the church but was an individual matter.

I contended if the practice was right in early days under the statement of Joseph Smith, it could be right and proper now, notwithstanding the law breaking features.

Thruout the investigation I was treated

After all is said and done I want to sustain my brethren and magnify them before the Saints. I want to be humble and full of charity and do the will of my father in heaven. I have an abiding faith in the eternal justice of things and would rather suffer wrong than to do wrong, and I ever want to be found building up and not tearing down.

I had a definite testimony of the soundness and correctness of the principle of Plural Marriage, and hope to be prepared to lay my life down for it if necessary.

I can't understand the attitude of some of my brethren, but am willing to leave all for final sinking out of our God, seeking to be an humble instrument in his hands at all times in doing good.

with a kindly spirit by the brethren generally, Bro. Grant alone being an exception. He appeared impatient, maintained I was out of harmony and that we are no use having time with me. Bro. Irvine was somewhat impulsive. Bro. Clawson, McKay and Whitney appeared generous and considerate and consistent.

My own feelings are these: That the investigation along the lines it is being carried out, is unwarranted. That the Quorum is not sustained, and that such actions as these will tend to lower them their influence among the Saints.

Bro. Grant said they were going to cut Bro Higgs off the Church, and his tone and manner were vindictive. My impression were that the brethren are not actuated by the proper spirit.

Bro. Seymour said; "if you had come to me for advice I would given you good advice"; My answer was that I did go to good men.

Oct. 2-1911- Denver

Attended a dinner party given by Mr. Chapell- 1300 Logan Av. The guest present Congressmen Mondell from Wyoming, Taylor & Rucker from Colorado, Ex Senator Henry M. Teller, Gov. Shafroth Mr. Sorg & Potter & Gooding of Idaho. Also two other gentlemen from Colo. A wonderfully pleasant time.

Oct. 3rd 1911

Pres. Taft visited Convention at 11:30. In connection with J. Arthur Eddy, Colo. Bradford Prince, New Mex., P. Sullivan of Wyo. I was appointed a Committeeman to meet the Guests and escort him into the Convention

Hall. This we did. A grand ovation was given the President as he entered.

Was elected assisted Secretary of Committee on Permanent Organization to work with Chairman Frank Mondell of Wyo., to get definite organization effected.

Returned home Via D & R. G. leaving Denver 8:15 P.M. arriving home Oct 5th at 2:50 A.M.

Full distance traveled 1500 miles.

We left 5:20 Sept. 26 on U.P. Ry Co. arriving at Denver 5:30 A.M. Sept. 27-

Other delegates present were the Members of the State Land Board. They left for home on Oct 1st leaving me to attend to the business.

President Woodruff. I told him I had done nothing except thru the council or ratification of members of his own quorum. He said I had no right to take council from members of the quorum, but that I should have gone to the President of the Church. I told him I supposed the Apostles named do nothing— at least a majority of the quorum would not— out of harmony with the desires of the First Presidency. I told him I heard one of the members of the 1st Presidency of the Church, (since dead) justify his son in entering the relation. He said ye Geo. Q. Cannon did bring reproach upon the church in letting Abram H. Cannon get into it. He was reproved for

Feby. 16- 1914. 295

called on Pres. Francis. M. Lyman to explain my attitude in the matter of new polygamous marriages being entered into contrary to the wishes of the Church Authorities. Being accused by Bro. L. of encouraging such marriage and attempting myself to assist in them I flatly but respectfully denied the charge. He accused me of associating with Heng Tanner and Fonie A. Kelsch in defying the Authorities. I denied this also, stating I had no criticism to offer against these brethren, but I had not been in association with them in the manner or for the purpose named.

Pres. Lyman maintained that it was a sin to enter into the relation since the Manifesto of

Abram's act. Abram didint need the girl - he had a large family, and he destroyed his usefulness in the Church. Such men as he, Geo. Q. Cannon Merrill, Teasdell, Cowley, Woodruff and Taylor," he said, "had brot reproach upon the church, and had done wrong. The nation has been invited to trouble us. Our religion when honestly lived, invites enough trouble, without wilfully violating our pledges."

He said, "of course Pres. Smith dont want to go back beyond his administration, and I think he has all he can take care of in his own administration." - leading me to think he refered to Pres. Smiths complicity in the present marriage entanglement.

I expressed my desire to be in harmony with the brethren so far as I could. That the Lord had blessed me with a large family for which I was grateful, but that I had not been encouraging recent plural marriages.

He closed by advising me to resign my position in the High Council of Grants Stake. He said You are a good man, active and much needed, but you have lost your usefulness and it is better to resign and not let the people use you as a target. He said of course you dont have to resign, but I advise you to. Just state business matters or something necessitates it and quietly drop out.

I WENT TO MY FILE LEADER AND RELATED THE CIRCUMSTANCE IN FULL. THEY ADVISED ME NOT TO RESIGN.

LATER I WAS INFORMED THAT CERTAIN HIGH OFFICIALS IN THIS CHURCH HAD ACCUSED ME OF RECENTLY PROPOSING TO A CERTAIN YOUNG LADY (NAMING HER). I REPLIED IN ASTONISHMENT THAT I WAS NOT EVEN ACQUAINTED WITH THE LADY, HAD NEVER MET HER THAT I KNEW OF. I DEMANDED TO BE CONFRONTED BY MY ACCUSERS WHO WERE HEBER J. GRANT AND BP O.P. MILLER. I WAS PROMISED A MEETING WOULD BE ARRANGED. LATER THE BROTHER HEARING THE MATTER IN CHARGE, TOLD ME THE ABOVE PARTIES DIDN'T CARE TO MEET ME, BUT THAT THAT MY

But if nobody will administer that retired in the Temple of the Lord, I believe other means may be resorted to by pure women whose desire is to raise up a righteous seed.

I believe God intended that every woman should have the opportunity of becoming a mother, and if her soul desired to, the means would be justified. Since the Church therefore has taken the statement of a man, not pretended to be a revelation, discontinued the obligation of its members to practice the principle, it now remains for each individual to follow his personal conviction in the matter; and that the Church should remain neutral and

not persecute or persecute, but be clear that to the enemy of righteousness.

The manifesto has virtually proclaimed that a certain percent of women must not marry (since women may not have their choice if it happens to fall upon a married man) The rule was instituted by men whose situation would not be injured by such a rule, they all being permitted to have a wife, but I maintain should such a rule be adopted by the women, resulting in the enforced bachelorhood of a large number of men, we would repeal and repeal the act.

Marriage is an eternal principle. Every human being

possessing the moral and physical qualifications, may marry. Rules of churches or nations to the contrary notwithstanding. It is a heaven born desire to marry and propogate. When that desire is stifled, the soul is in danger. God giving that desire, will not despise it smothered, because a bunch of men, already loaded up with wives, decide for political reasons, that the practice shall cease. I will take my chance for an eternal heritage with my Heavenly Father, as a believer in marriage let it be monogamous or polygamous. Let others believe and act as they will I am for "sentimating" and supporting

The sin in marriage is the prevention of off-spring. I believe in children. It do matter so much just how they come as ~~what~~ that they do come and they come thru righteous motives and actions.

I can look at marriage in no other way now. If the future changes me, why I will change.

I support and sustain in my heart Pres. Jos. F. Smith as the Prophet and mouth-piece of God, but I do not recognize in the Quorum of the Apostles power or authority to handle me or counsel me contrary to the wishes of my Stake President.